

REMARKS

This Response is submitted in reply to the October 9, 2007 Office Action and in accordance with the telephone interview conducted on January 16, 2008. Claims 1, 18, 31, 32, 36 and 37 have been amended. No new matter was added by these amendments.

A Petition for One Month Extension of Time and a Request for Continued Examination are submitted herewith. Please charge Deposit Account No. 02-1818 for the Extension of Time, Request for Continued Examination and any other fees due in association with this Response.

The Office Action rejected Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 12, 14, 15, 18 to 23, 28 to 30, 33 to 39, 41 and 42 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over United States Patent No. 6,832,957 Falconer ("Falconer") in view of UK Patent Application No. GB 2083936 to Hurst et al. ("Hurst"). Applicants respectfully disagree with this rejection. Nevertheless, Applicants have amended independent Claims 1, 18, 36 and 37 as discussed during the January 16, 2008 interview to clarify certain of the existing claims.

Falconer discloses a gaming device including multiple sets of reels. A player places wagers on one or more paylines associated with each of the sets of reels. Each set of reels independently randomly generates an outcome including a plurality of symbols. The gaming device determines if the player is entitled to any awards by checking the symbols associated with each of the paylines wagered on by the player. If the player is entitled to an award, the gaming device provides the player with such an award.

Thus, in Falconer, each set of reels generates its own respective outcome. For example, in one embodiment, a player is provided with an award if a designated symbol occurs once on one set of reels, twice on a second set of reels and three times on a third set of reels. (See column 7, lines 36 to 60). If the additional sets of reels were copies of the first set of reels, all of the sets of reels would generate the same outcome, and this embodiment would not make sense. In another embodiment of Falconer, the gaming device provides a bonus award if the same combination of symbols appears on a payline in two or more sets of reels. (See column 8, lines 6 to 9). Similarly, this

embodiment would not make sense if each of the additional sets of reels were copies of the first set of reels.

Amended independent Claim 1 is directed to a gaming device including at least one processor programmed to operate with at least one display device for each play of a game to: (a) separately and simultaneously display a plurality of reel displays of a set of reels, wherein each of said reel displays includes a copy of said set of reels and is associated with a different one of a plurality of paylines; (b) activate the set of reels to generate a plurality of symbols; (c) display the same plurality of said symbols generated on the set of reels on each of the reel displays based on said symbols generated on said set of reels, wherein each reel display identifies a combination of symbols occurring on a different one of said plurality of paylines; and (d) provide an award to a player based on any winning combinations of symbols occurring on said paylines.

The January 16, 2008 interview centered around how Claim 1 distinguishes over Falconer and the Examiner's opinion, that in theory, each of the sets of reels in Falconer could generate the same outcome, thus displaying the same plurality of generated symbols. During the interview, Applicants' representative and the Examiners agreed, subject to a new prior art search in view of any amendments made, that amending the independent claims to clarify the processor or method steps are carried out for each play of the game, as opposed to a play of the game, distinguishes over Falconer and also the combination of Falconer and Hurst.

Hurst discloses a slot-type gaming device. In one embodiment, at random "after a game" (page 2, line 2) a reproduction of the reels may be displayed on a screen. In Hurst, the reproduction of the reels occurs randomly after a play of the game, not for each play of the game. For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 12, 14, 15, 18 to 23, 28 to 30, 33 to 39, 41 and 42 are patentable over the combination of Falconer and Hurst and are in condition for formal allowance.

The Office Action rejected Claims 3 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Falconer in view of Hurst and United States Application No. 2004/0137978 to Cole et al. ("Cole"). Applicants respectfully disagree with this rejection. For the same reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 3 and 4 are

patentable over the combination of Falconer, Hurst and Cole and are in condition for formal allowance.

The Office Action rejected Claims 7 to 11 and 24 to 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Falconer in view of Hurst and United States Patent No. 6,336,863 to Baerlocher et al. ("Baerlocher"). Applicants respectfully disagree with this rejection. For the same reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent Claims 7 to 11 and 24 to 27 are patentable over the combination of Falconer, Hurst and Baerlocher and stand in condition for formal allowance.

The Office Action rejected Claims 16, 31 and 40 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Falconer in view of Hurst and United States Patent Publication No. 2002/0082075 to Meyer ("Meyer"). Applicants respectfully disagree with this rejection. For the same reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent Claims 16, 31 and 40 are patentable over the combination of Falconer, Hurst and Meyer and stand in condition for formal allowance.


The Office Action rejected Claims 17 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Falconer in view of Hurst and United States Patent Publication No. 2003/0017868 to Crawford ("Crawford"). Applicants respectfully disagree with this rejection. For the same reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent Claims 17 and 32 are patentable over the combination of Falconer, Hurst and Crawford and stand in condition for formal allowance.

Applicants have made an earnest endeavor to place this application in condition for formal allowance and in the absence of more pertinent art, such action is courteously solicited. If the Examiner has any questions regarding this Response, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLP

BY


Adam H. Masia
Reg. No. 35,602
Customer No. 29159

Date: January 30, 2008